

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Fig(s). 1-7, contained in drawing sheet(s) 1-7, with the attached replacement figure(s).

The following changes are made to the drawings: in Fig. 1, reference number 250 has been changed to 252 and reference number 350 has been changed in 352; in Fig. 5, the designation of the section cut has been changed from A-A to 5-5. Corresponding changes have been made to the specification. No new matter has been added.

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were previously pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-27 remain pending for examination, with claims 1, 10, and 19 being independent claims. No new matter has been added.

Telephone Interview

The undersigned thanks Examiner Nguyen for the courtesies extended by him during the telephone interview on March 25, 2005. During the interview, the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,683,556 was discussed. The undersigned briefly described the disclosure of the '556 patent, contrasted it with Applicant's invention, and suggested the changes to the claims made by this amendment. Although no specific agreement was reached, the undersigned indicated that he would effect the amendments presented herein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 19, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,682,556 to Leliaert.

Leliaert shows an abrasive blast wheel that includes a control cage 28 that has an annular flange 30 located at the end of the control cage 28 opposite a control cage opening 54. The annular flange of Leliaert appears to be thinner than the body of the control cage.

It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 10, and 19, as amended, are not anticipated by Leliaert for at least the reason that Leliaert does not disclose a control cage channel where at least a portion of the channel is in axial alignment with a media outlet.

It is further submitted that claims 2, 4, 11, and 20, all of which depend from amended claims 1, 10, or 19, are not anticipated by Leliaert for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested. This application should now be in condition for allowance; a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50/2762.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Aaron W. Moore, Reg. No. 52,043
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
Tel. (617) 395-7000

Date: March 28, 2005